REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1-6, 8 and 10-34 were examined and rejected. Independent claims 1, 17, 24 and 30 are amended. Claims 7 and 9 were cancelled previously. Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraph [0034] of the specification as filed. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-26, 28-31, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0182469 of Lok et al. ("Lok") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,851 to Suzuki et al. ("Suzuki").

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> A method for displaying a GUI, comprising:
> receiving, via a network, a motion command, **a control flag**, an index, a plurality of display coordinates and a time value at a first device from a second device, wherein the motion command . . . directs animation of the image object at the plurality of display coordinates over the received time period **at a transition rate indicated by the control flag** . . .
> (emphasis added).

As such, claim1 includes the limitation that a control flag is sent from a second device to the first device, and that this flag is used for indicating the transition rate of the animation over the received time period. In other words, the flag indicates to the first device whether the animation is to be performed, for example, at a linear rate (same speed over the received time period), at an accelerated rate (speeds up over the received time period), or at some other rate over the received time period.

Lok teaches a distributed computer system with at least one server and one remote client. (Lok, paragraph [0024]). Lok further teaches a server may be configured to communicate a message to a user interface toolkit on a remote client, and the user interface toolkit on the remote client may be configured to render a graphical item in response to the message. (Lok, paragraph [0027]). However, Lok does not teach or suggest the transmission of a control flag to indicate the animation speed over a received time period.

Furthermore, Suzuki does not cure the deficiencies of Lok. Suzuki teaches a graphical display method, where a server (second device) instructs a terminal (first device) to graphically display animations of characters according to a series of motion data. (Suzuki, col. 3, lines 3-6). The motion data may be a set of coordinates or angles over a corresponding set of time intervals. (Suzuki, col. 9, lines 26-30; Figure 3). To this end, Suzuki teaches the transmission of a motion command, a plurality of coordinates, and a time interval. Suzuki also teaches that different types of interpolation may be used at the terminal (first device) to determine the transition rate of the animation within a particular time period. (Suzuki, col. 9, lines 46-61).

However, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the transmission of **a control flag** from the server (second device) to the terminal (first device) to control the transition rate of the animation. In Suzuki, the transition rate in a given time interval is fixed by the type of interpolation used at the terminal. (See Suzuki, col. 9, lines 46-61). For example, if linear interpolation is used in the terminal of Suzuki, then in order to accelerate an animation over a given time period, the server has to be split up the animation into subintervals and coordinates over that time period and send theses additional motion data to the terminal. The transmission of these additional motion data may take up additional bandwidth and may slow down the network between the server and the terminal.

In contrast, the method of claim 1 eliminates the need to split up an animation into subintervals at the server. In claim 1, different transition rates over a given time interval can be achieved by sending **a control flag** from the second device to the first device to indicate the transition rate without having to send additional coordinates and time information as compared to Suzuki.

For at least these reasons, any combination of Lok and Suzuki would fail to teach or suggest the transmission of **a control flag** to indicate transition rate of the animation, because both Lok and Suzuki fail to teach or suggest such limitation. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Lok and Suzuki.

Claims 17, 24, and 30, as amended, contain similar limitations as to the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, at least for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request

withdrawal of the rejections of claims 17, 24 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Lok and Suzuki.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 12-13, 15-16, 18-20, 22-23, 25-26, 28-29, 31, 33 and 34 depend directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 17, 24 and 30 and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim. Hence, at least for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 5, 8, 12-13, 15-16, 18-20, 22-23, 25-26, 28-29, 31, 33 and 34 are allowable.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 21, 27 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lok in view of Suzuki and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,821 to Merrill et al ("Merrill"). Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 21, 27 and 32 depend directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 17, 24 and 30, and thus include similar limitations as to the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above.

Merrill teaches an animation system which provides synchronization services to synchronize actions of multiple characters displayed simultaneously (Merrill, Abstract). In particular, Merrill teaches the transmission of a unique ID, frame position, and time duration from a server. (Merrill, col. 8, lines 48-60). Merrill further teaches the transmission of Stop, Wait, and Interrupt commands. (Merrill, col. 36, lines 51-56). However, these commands are used for stopping the animation and do not alter the transition rate of the animation during playback. Hence, Merrill fails to teach or suggest the transmission of **a control flag** to control the transition rate of the animation.

For at least these reasons, any combination of Lok, Suzuki, and Merrill would fail to teach or suggest the transmission of **a control flag** to control the transition rate of the animation, because Lok, Suzuki, and Merrill fail to teach or suggest such feature. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 21, 27 and 32, which depend directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 17, 24 and 30, are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Lok and Suzuki and in further view of Merrill.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lok in view of Suzuki and in further view of Richardson (NPL Document, "The RFB Protocol"). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14, which depends on claim 1, is patentable over a combination

of Lok, Suzuki, and Richardson because Lok, Suzuki, and Richardson also fails to teach or suggest the transmission of **a control flag** to control the transition rate of the animation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:___8\1 e\o9___   _____
                            Michael J. Mallie
                            Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300